

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 8, 2006. Claims 84, 86-88, 91 and 95-97 are presented herewith for consideration.

Objection to the Specification:

The specification was objected to as including an informality. This informality has been corrected.

Objection to the Claims:

Claims 86 and 95 [*sic*] have been objected to as including informalities. These informalities have been corrected.

Rejection of Claims 84, 86-88, 91 and 95-97 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 84, 86-88, 91 and 95-97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,670,992 to Yasuhara ("Yasuhara"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Each of Claims 84, 86-88, 91 and 95-97 recite in pertinent part:

a first electronic display screen ...

and

a support structure, said support structure having a work space including a contact-sensitive second electronic display screen, said contact-sensitive electronic display screen being separate from the first electronic display screen.

Addressing the second recited element above, the Examiner asserts that Yasuhara discloses "a support structure, said support having a work space (i.e., tablet) including a contact-sensitive second electronic display screen." Applicants respectfully disagree.

The tablet 10 of Yasuhara is not an electronic display screen as required by each of the claims. Tablet 10 of Yasuhara is incapable of electronically displaying anything. It cannot electronically display graphical images. To the contrary, tablet 10 is a "coordinate input surface" (col. 3, lines 21-22). A user draws or sketches an image on the tablet using an associated pen, which image is sensed by the pressure sensitive sensing apparatus. The tablet 10 does not display the image. Instead, the image is transferred to the separate video display 2.

At col. 3, lines 28-42, Yasuhara makes clear that the tablet 10 merely functions as a coordinate input surface and does not electronically display any images. The separate video display monitor 2 displays the images generated by tablet 10:

When the user draws a locus by slightly touching the tablet 10 with the attachment pan 11 or with the fingertip while pushing the executing button 8A or 8b, a pen-shaped cursor 21 is displayed on a picture screen 2a of the monitor 2 and the cursor 21 moves in tandem with the locus of the fingertip or the like to display the locus as an image . . .

The Examiner's mistaken reading of Yasuhara may have derived from Figures 6A, 6B, or 7 of Yasuhara. These figures however do not show images displayed on tablet 10. Instead, Figures 6A, 6B and 7 of Yasuhara show images displayed on the video display 2:

"If the user depresses the eraser button 18 in the menu selecting area 10c and slightly touches the picture-making areas 10b with the accessory pen 11 or the like, **an eraser-shaped cursor 21a is displayed in the background of the previously drawn on the picture on the picture screen 2a of the monitor 2 as shown in FIG. 6a . . .**"

Col. 8, lines 17-22 (emphasis added). See also col. 8, lines 25-28 and lines 29-41 for similar disclosures for Yasuhara FIG's 6B and 7. Thus, FIGs. 6A, 6B and 7 of Yasuhara do not support tablet 10 operating as an electronic display screen.

As the feature of a second electronic display screen, separate from the first electronic display screen, is expressly called for in the claims and is nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in Yasuhara, it is respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

Based on the above, reconsideration of Claims 84, 86-88, 91 and 95-97 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2006

By: 

Brian I. Marcus
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: 415-369-9660
Facsimile: 415-369-9665

- 10 -

linker/112/Response to 2-8-06 Office Action